

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 23, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The pending claims, claims 2-5, 8 and 10, were rejected. By this Response, claims 2 and 10 have been amended, and claim 8 has been canceled. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenji (JP 02-055292) in view of Amai (US 20030034056). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 10, as amended, requires that the gas-liquid separator have a plurality of fins to form a meandering passage. Due to this particular gas-liquid separator structure, the mist (liquid) efficiently is separated from input gas and collected. See for instance page 10, paragraph [0021] of Applicants' specification, and Figures 4(a) and (b).

Kenji and Amai, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such a fin structure for a gas-liquid separator to form a meandering passage therein. As the Examiner asserts, Amai discloses a mist-trap (132) that removes air-bubbles in liquid drops discharged from an inner cup. See paragraph 0087. However, this mere schematic showing of trap 132 suggests nothing of Applicants' currently claimed separator structure.

For at least these reasons, amended claim 10 is unobvious.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 2 and 3 as being unpatentable over Kenji in view of Seikyu (JP 2003-174016), McMillen (US 5,316,579) and Moulene (US 5,034,688). The Examiner rejected claims 3-5 as being unpatentable over Kenji, Seikyu, McMillen, Moulene and further in view of Hiroyuki (JP 2001-156047).

Applicants have canceled claim 8 and amended claim 2 such that the remaining claims directly or indirectly depend on claim 10. Thus, claims 2-5 are unobvious for at least the reasons that claim 10 is unobvious. That is, because Kenji and Amai do not suggest a gas-liquid separator that has a plurality of fins that form a meandering passage, Applicants respectfully urge

that the claims, as amended, are unobvious, and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

### **Request for Interview**

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033082 M 335.**

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

/Michael A. Makuch/

Michael A. Makuch  
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: June 19, 2009

1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329